Message

From: Kraft, Andrew [Kraft.Andrew@epa.gov]

Sent: 5/6/2019 3:35:12 PM

To: Phillips, Linda [Phillips.Linda@epa.gov]
CC: Morozov, Viktor [Morozov.Viktor@epa.gov]

Subject: RE: Systematic review to Update the PCB Exposure Estimation Tool

Okay, great, thanks Linda.

From: Phillips, Linda

Sent: Monday, May 06, 2019 11:33 AM

To: Kraft, Andrew < Kraft. Andrew@epa.gov>
Cc: Morozov, Viktor < Morozov. Viktor@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Systematic review to Update the PCB Exposure Estimation Tool

Thanks Andrew. I do not think that there is a need to share it with the SRWG right now. It will be going to several internal EPA reviewers and then an external review panel so there will plenty of opportunities for comment. Thanks. Linda

Linda J. Phillips, Ph.D.

National Center for Environmental Assessment
Office of Research and Development
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ronald Reagan Building Room 71290
Telephone: (202) 564-8252
email: phillips.linda@epa.gov

Mailing Address:

1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (8623R)

Washington, DC 20460

From: Kraft, Andrew

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2019 4:36 PM

To: Phillips, Linda < Phillips. Linda@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Systematic review to Update the PCB Exposure Estimation Tool

Hi Linda,

Thanks for sharing. I'm sorry I don't have time to look at this in detail right now (I could share it with the SRWG if you wanted a more thorough look?). One thing I did want to flag for you has to do with the full text evaluations. Typically, best practices in systematic review is to separate considerations of study relevance from considerations of study reliability and risk-of-bias (e.g., title/abstract and then full text screening for relevance, and separately review of study quality). Most notably, since your GAFs are in essence exclusion criteria (it sounded like if one of those GAFs was not met, the study wasn't included), the applicability and utility considerations would really be much better/more appropriately addressed as part of your PECO. Some concerns are also likely to be raised regarding aspects of the uncertainty and variability criterion and evaluation and review criteria (e.g., for the latter, it is generally preferable to try to acquire or translate the article so that it can be screened similarly to the other studies, and we have also been encouraged to include non-peer reviewed articles, but I think there is wiggle room there).

I hope this is at least somewhat helpful, and please let me know if you want me (at some later point) or someone else in the SRWG (more immediately) to look in more detail. Best of luck with the review and updating!

Have a great weekend, Andrew From: Phillips, Linda

Sent: Friday, April 26, 2019 4:07 PM

To: Kraft, Andrew < Kraft. Andrew@epa.gov>

Subject: Systematic review to Update the PCB Exposure Estimation Tool

Hi Andrew - I have been working on the systematic review of the literature to update the PCB Exposure Estimation Tool, which will undergo both internal and external peer review later this year. I have prepared the attached document to summarize what was done to update the Tool. While this document is not the subject of the peer review (the Tool is), I think it will be a good resource for the peer reviewers because it provides some background on the Tool and the process used to update it. Viktor suggested that you might be interested in taking a look at it before I send it out to the internal reviewers along with the Tool (hopefully by mid-May), so I am attaching it here. If you have time, I would appreciate getting your thoughts on it. Thanks in advance. Linda

Linda J. Phillips, Ph.D.

National Center for Environmental Assessment
Office of Research and Development
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ronald Reagan Building Room 71290
Telephone: (202) 564-8252
email: phillips.linda@epa.gov
Mailing Address:
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (8623R)
Washington, DC 20460